

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING
June 28, 2016 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Members Present:

Christopher Beer, Chairman
Paul Amato
Tim Finan
Janet Langdell
Susan Robinson
Kevin Federico, BOS representative
Jacob LaFontaine, Alternate member

Staff:

Lincoln Daley, Comm. Dev. Director
Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary
Dave Bosquet, Videographer

MINUTES:

1. Approval of minutes from 5/24/16.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **Charles M Levine & Margaret M Hatfield and Levine, Charles M RCVBL Trust – Fernwood Dr – Map 48, Lots 55-1, 55-2 & 58.** Public Hearing for a lot line adjustment to consolidate three (3) residential lots into two (2) lots.
(New application – Monadnock Survey, Inc.)
3. **Paul K. Amato Trust of October 29, 1998/Paul K and Nancy A Amato, Co-Trustees – Mile Slip Rd - Map 50, Lot 7.** Public Hearing for design review of a conventional six (6) lot residential subdivision, and a waiver request from Milford Development Regulations, Article V, Section 5.08, *Open Space Conservation Developments.*
(New application – Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.)

OTHER BUSINESS:

4. **Hammer Family Realty I, LLC/Salt Creek Properties, LLC - Hammond Rd – Map 43, Lots 71 & 75 and Map 48, Lot 33 .** Major site plan to construct a new automobile dealership with associated display areas.
(Application tabled from 5/24/16 meeting)
5. **Little Nell Trust/Milred Ninety Six, LLC – Capron Rd – Map 43, Lots 57 & 58.** Major site plan to construct 124 new apartments consisting of 3 three-story garden style homes and 4 four-unit townhomes with associated site improvements.
*(Application tabled from 5/24/16 meeting) ***Request to table to the 7/26/16 meeting.*

Chairman Beer called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.. He introduced the Board and staff and explained the ground rules for the public hearing.

MINUTES:

S. Wilson brought up one correction for the minutes. Paul Amato made a motion to accept the minutes of May 24, 2016, as amended. J. Lafontaine seconded. T. Finan and K. Federico abstained and all else in favor. Motion carried by a vote of 5-0-2.

NEW BUSINESS:

Charles M Levine & Margaret M Hatfield and Levine, Charles M RCVBL Trust – Fernwood Dr – Map 48, Lots 55-1, 55-2 & 58. Public Hearing for a lot line adjustment to consolidate three (3) residential lots into two (2) lots.

C. Beer read the notice of hearing and stated that the application was complete, per the staff memo. J. Langdell made a motion to accept the application. P. Amato seconded and all in favor; motion carried 7-0-0. J. Langdell made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. P. Amato seconded and all in favor; motion carried 7-0-0. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

Abutters:

Andrew Frades, Fernwood Dr

Chairman Beer recognized:

Dawn Tuomala, Monadnock Survey, Inc.

Charles Levine, Charles M Levin Rev Trust & Margaret M Hatfield Rev Trust

D. Tuomala presented plans dated 6/22/16 and explained the proposal that will realign the two vacant lots, 55-1 and 55-2, and add a little over one (1) acre, shown as Parcel A, to lot 58 which will add privacy for the existing single family house on that lot.

L. Daley referenced the staff memo dated 6/26/16 and stated that he is satisfied with the corrections made to the plan to clearly identify the parcel to be consolidated into lot 55-1.

J. Langdell inquired about note #2. L. Daley responded that in discussion with the applicant and upon review of the plan showing the access easements, he is satisfied with the current language because the easements won't change; staff recommendation #2 should be removed.

P. Amato inquired about the reference to the existing EOA. D. Tuomala said it is the effluent disposal area or leach field for the current house and explained the NH DES requirements for individual septic systems.

J. Langdell asked if there were any comments from Conservation Commission. L. Daley said he had discussion with the Conservation Coordinator pertaining to the new lot that shows a series of culverts. These go back to the original subdivision plan to cross the wetland areas via culverts and has been preapproved already. There are no further comments from the Conservation or Environmental Coordinators.

Chairman Beer opened the public portion of the meeting; there being none, the public portion was closed.

K. Federico made a motion to conditionally approve the application subject to staff recommendations. J. Langdell seconded and read the conditions; #1 and #3. D. Tuomala stated that recommendation #1 has been corrected on this plan and that all monumentation has been set. L. Daley stated that the applicant will still need to submit a letter from a surveyor attesting that the bounds have been set. The motion was amended to reflect that there is only one staff recommendation. A vote was called and all in favor; motion carried unanimously 7-0-0.

Paul K. Amato Trust of October 29, 1998/Paul K and Nancy A Amato, Co-Trustees – Mile Slip Rd - Map 50, Lot 7. Public Hearing for design review of a conventional six (6) lot residential subdivision,

and a waiver request from Milford Development Regulations, Article V, Section 5.08, *Open Space Conservation Developments*.

Paul Amato recused himself from the Board for this application.

C. Beer read the notice of hearing and stated that the application was complete, per the staff memo. S. Robinson made a motion to accept the application. K. Federico seconded and all in favor; motion carried 6-0-0. J. Langdell made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. T. Finan seconded and all in favor; motion carried 6-0-0. S. Wilson read the abutters list into the record.

No abutters were present.

Chairman Beer recognized:

Patrick Colburn, Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.

Paul Amato, Paul K. Amato Trust of Oct. 29, 1998

P. Colburn presented plans dated 6/1/16 and presented application for design review to proceed with a subdivision using conventional design. The Development Regulations and Zoning Ordinance require any subdivision exceeding five lots be an Open Space type subdivision; however, Section 5.08 does allow for this through the waiver process, so we have submitted the waiver request along with a narrative addressing the criteria pursuant to that section of the Ordinance. The shape of the lot, with a tremendous amount of frontage along Mile Slip Rd has very little depth so open space doesn't make sense here. Open space developments are generally clustered to reduce roadway length and according to the Ordinance the open space lots need to have the same minimum frontage as a conventional lot. He then referenced the table on the plan and noted that lots 7-2 and 7-3 only meet the minimum frontage in either case. The other lots exceed the frontage requirements because they are encumbered by natural features. There are two jurisdictional wetland complexes. The original subdivision was going to be for seven (7) lots but Mr. Amato settled on six (6) lots due to the constructability of the driveways. He then described the layout of the lots and said all driveways will accommodate safe sight distance requirements.

L. Daley said Mile Slip Rd is designated as a scenic road and as such, there are certain statutory requirements and impacts to trees and stone walls require a Scenic Road Hearing; however, upon review of RSA 231:157 and 231:158, this type of development would not require a Scenic Road Hearing. P. Colburn referenced sheet #6 to describe the impact of this development. We have provided profiles and sight distance for each driveway and all achieve 200 ft of all-season safe sight distance. The cut into the stone wall will only be the width of the driveway aprons or a little wider on lot 7-5 to facilitate the sight distance for oncoming traffic for. Lots 7, 7-1 and 7-2 don't have any stone walls. J. Langdell suggested that the stones be re-incorporated into other features on the property, which would be consistent with the intent of the ordinance. P. Amato confirmed that the stones were in piles not actual structural walls and said he didn't mind going through the Scenic Rd process because we would only have to mark the trees over 15" diameter that are in the Town's ROW. After a brief discussion about the technical aspects, P. Colburn stated that they will tie a ribbon around any trees with a diameter of 15" or larger to be removed within the limits of grading and clearing for the driveways. L. Daley asked the Board to include the relevant portion of the Zoning Ordinance 6.04.6.D.1, *List of Resources to Consider for Preservation* in the waiver, if granted. J. Langdell also suggested referencing 6.04.4.B.

S. Robinson inquired about the grade in this area of Mile Slip Rd. P. Amato said this section is very level, almost no grade.

J. Langdell asked if there were any comments from the Conservation Commission or Public Works. L. Daley said there were no comments, at this juncture in time. When the interdepartmental reviews go before the department heads for final application, there will probably be comments along the way. P. Amato noted that we have been working with Rick Reindeau of DPW on ways to possibly improve that section of the road and provided the engineering. Mile Slip Rd was never designed; it is pieces of paved dirt road. L. Daley said there has been discussion with the Conservation Coordinator pertaining to trail connectivity and comments made in the staff memo; however, in looking at the existing connections in the area, this may be redundant or excessive.

Chairman Beer opened the public portion of the meeting.

A. Fraizer stated that the Conservation Commission Coordinator does not speak for the full commission and we have not seen this plan. My initial reaction is that we would not have a problem either, but I would like to hold right to discuss at our next meeting and get input from the Commission. I have been out there and know the lots, so in this case the waiver would be ok, but going forward we would like to get a copy of the plan and I am glad that Staff thought about an easement. A brief discussion on process followed. L. Daley then provided an overhead plan that showed the area including the Sherburne and Pratt properties. A. Fraizer described the trails and conservation properties. P. Amato further described accesses in the Mile Slip area. He also explained that there is no place for anyone to park if there were an easement on this property. J. Langdell summarized that the Conservation Commission Chairperson does not have concerns with the waiver for conventional versus open space but would like consideration to discuss trail access in the future.

Chairman Beer closed the public hearing.

J. Langdell asked, given the design standards in the Open Space Conservation District Ordinance and the list of resources to consider for preservation, if is there anything else particular to this land that would suggest that this should be considered as an open space subdivision? There were no further comments from the Board.

J. Langdell made a motion to grant the waiver relative to and in consideration of the Milford Zoning Ordinance, Sections 6.04.4.B and 6.04.6.D.1, in accordance with Milford Development Regulations, Article V, Section 5.08, to proceed with conventional design criteria for final application. K. Federico seconded and all in favor. Motion carried unanimously; 6-0-0.

J. Langdell made a motion to close the design review application. K. Federico seconded and all in favor. Motion carried unanimously; 6-0-0.

P. Amato returned to the Board.

Hammer Family Realty I, LLC/Salt Creek Properties, LLC - Hammond Rd – Map 43, Lots 71 & 75 and Map 48, Lot 33 . Major site plan to construct a new automobile dealership with associated display areas.

Abutters present:

Steve Desmarais, Salt Creek Properties

C. Beer recognized:

David Hammer, Contemporary Auto

Audrey Hammer, Hammer Family Realty, LLC

Earl Sandford, Sandford Surveying

Jonathan Smith, Warren Street Architects

D. Hammer said we received the Special Exception for the wetlands disturbance and spent a lot of time working out the various issues that were addressed at the last meeting. We are asking for conditional approval tonight and would like to work with staff to finalize all the details.

E. Sandford presented plans dated 6/21/16 and gave a brief overview of the revisions.

- The building footprint has been solidified and we've eliminated the second floor square footage, so even though the footprint has increased, it still rounds to 25,000 SF. There are no changes to the wetland and buffer impacts and the pavement lines will remain the same, although we did push the rain garden back a bit.
- We've also added two sheets to the plan set; the Hammond Road Improvement plan for the widening of Hammond Rd and sheet #12 that shows details for the proposed water line serving this site.
- The Cost Submittal dated 6/22/16 was distributed. We've staked out the limits of excavation showing a twenty (20') ft paved width. Most of the road will have a two (2') ft shoulder and a two (2') ft drainage area.

The DPW Director said he would allow a one (1') ft shoulder with one (1') ft drainage in certain areas. This will be a significant improvement to the road from its current condition. It is already twenty (20') ft wide for the first 100 feet of road so we will cut in the pavement and blend in to match. We will also blend in at the JP Pest portion. There will be a twenty (20') ft easement from Nathaniel Ln for the water line which has been designated to go all the way back to DPW. J. Langdell stated that completion of that is a requirement for this development. S. Desmarais clarified that there will be a 12" line on South St and a 10" line on Nathaniel Ln. E. Sandford said the water has been sized appropriately. We are currently talking with Dave Boucher, Water Utilities Superintendent, and calculations are being massaged. This will be engineered to meet all requirements for fire safety and facility usage on the property.

- The Car Stock Capacity Table has been revised. The parking inventory is based on 8'x18' or 8'x20' spaces and we came up with a total 450 total vehicles as maximum on site. We will also add a note on the plan to that effect. He presented a Parking Worksheet and described the parking areas in detail. The drive aisles will be 24ft wide so there will be no issues with circulation. There is plenty of room for two-way traffic. The turning radii have been designed to accommodate an eighty (80') ft tractor trailer and there is an area dedicated to offloading without going into the raingarden. We will demonstrate that on the final plan.

E. Sandford reviewed Staff comments and provided the following responses:

1. The site is adequate as designed for the full operation. D. Hammer added that this is significantly more parking than we currently have and we are confident that this will be sufficient to meet our needs now and in the foreseeable future.
2. The plan has been revised to show the one-story proposed structure.
3. The plan and table have been cleaned up. C. Beer requested that the plans indicate the maximum capacity number as outdoor parking.
4. We will remove the dotted spaces and will show white space dedicated to the expected number of cars.
5. We are not going to use the 8x18 spaces but will show the area as having fifteen (15) cars and there is ample room. C Beer asked that the applicant specifically indicate that there is a fifteen (15) car limit for that space.
6. We will do away with the "Non-Striped" spaces.
7. We are in discussion with Gloria Andrews of NH DES regarding processing the AoT permit. The dredge & fill and wetland permits are pending. The Septic has been designed and is ready to go and two Special Exceptions were granted by the ZBA on June 2, 2016. We will add all approvals to the plan.
8. We will revise the note to include impact fees and the Hammond Rd improvements, but costs and timing will have to be discussed. L. Daley clarified that the note state *will or shall require* impact fees.
9. It is currently under review and there are no issues.
10. This is also currently under review and we have no issues with adding the note.
11. Lot "F" will have the same grass pavers and will be clarified on sheet #4.
12. We are looking for guidance from staff. L. Daley said he has some concern that there are only two species of trees shown on the plan and this would be an opportunity to include more diversity on the overall landscape plan, such as maple trees. Staff and the applicant can work together on the landscaping.
13. This was an oversight and has been corrected.
14. The numbers are based on regulatory requirements so we've added notes on the plan regarding if the landscaping is existing or to be planted.
15. We will correct the detail to match the dimensions on plan; the full size is 45' x 13' and half will be for the dumpster and half for tires.
16. We have submitted a waiver request and retracted it on the condition that we will work with staff and modify the plan. L. Daley clarified that the waiver request was for relief of how the caliper is measured and the species types. I hope the Board will accept the condition that staff will work with the applicant to meet the intent of our landscape regulations and address any landscaping related issues. J. Langdell noted that the

Board did not get a copy of the waiver request to review prior to the meeting but the letter that was in the packets specifically talks about our previous discussions pertaining to inconsistencies in our regulations as to how things are sized out. C. Beer clarified that the waiver request form was not submitted, just a letter from the applicant and that no waiver will be required. The applicant will work with staff to address the landscaping requirements. L. Daley said he was comfortable that the overall landscaping plan meets the intent of our regulations and is an attractive plan for the property and for the Town. J. Langdell requested that the letter dated 6/21/16 be withdrawn as discussed and a copy be placed in the file.

17. The details will be finalized with comments from AoT and we are fine with adding a condition that there be resolution of the engineering details with the Town Engineer and NH DES.

J. Langdell asked if any comments were submitted from the Conservation Commission. A. Fraizer replied that the Commission did a site walk and submitted comments previously; we have no new comments.

Architectural:

E. Sandford submitted revised plans dated 6/17/16. The entrance has been switched from the last meeting and it's a very workable design. The grade of the finished floor slab is only two (2') ft lower than the highest point on 101 and a brief discussion on the line of sight followed. D. Hammer said he was excited about the new design and explained the functionality, layout and flow of the new building that will contain a showroom, retail parts, parts storage, employee areas, customer waiting area and a service area with two (2) detail bays, thirteen (13) lifts and one (1) alignment machine. There will also be dedicated heavy duty access. Lot B is intended as a bullpen for vehicles; customer serviced cars, but not for the customers themselves. He referenced the Chrysler Design Intent Document that lays out what is critical for the front façade. The ratio of the arch to the roofline is really important and we are hoping to relocate the existing arch and wall signage. The color scheme will be Pelican Gray; the materials will be Alucabond panels and EFIS for the front and insulated panels with vertical ribbing for the back shop areas, similar to the Alene Candles building. J. Smith presented samples and said that the glass facing 101 would be clear, not reflective, as the intent is to see the cars. D. Hammer added that the interior will be bright colors with natural and LED lighting. It will provide a better work environment.

J. Langdell noted that the eye level descriptions were very helpful given that we try to discourage flat roof buildings. Are there any concerns from the Board regarding the visibility of HVAC equipment as the false rise does not go all the way across and there are some gaps. P. Amato said he felt the building would be designed so that the rooftop units would be masked from Hammond Rd and Rte 101. D. Hammer said we are still working on the design and explained that the equipment will be approximately 110ft back. P. Amato said he didn't think we needed to do anything; there was agreement from the Board.

P. Amato inquired about the roof drains. E. Sandford referenced sheet #3 and explained that we are still working on the final plan but the two risers will go into the subsurface system.

Signage:

D. Hammer explained that there will be three signs out front. We are hoping to move the grand sign from 320 Elm St to the new facility and relocate it near the entrance. There will be a new sign for the pre-owned inventory perpendicular to Hammond Rd. We are also proposing an electronic message board sign but it is still being developed. The message board will show our specials but there will also be room for public service events and announcements. There will be an issue with height due to the elevation at the proposed location of the sign; one will see right over a fifteen (15') ft sign from the road. Our main concern is for the safety of cars driving by on the road and we will work with staff on a variance for the height. J. Langdell inquired if granite could be used for the posts. D. Hammer said the materials will be something that makes sense. P. Amato asked if the current signage on Elm St met regulations. D. Hammer said no, they had obtained a variance for the total wall square footage. L. Daley brought up the internal signage. D. Hammer said we will need to have a clear directional signage plan and are working on defining our needs. L. Daley inquired if there would be signage for the one-way egress on the southern side of the building. D. Hammer said he is hesitant because if we install an overhead door, there may be instances where we would need to use both directions and there is sufficient space, 24'-25', to accommodate for doors, vehicles and foot traffic. L. Daley asked if there would be bollards around the mechanical areas to protect the transformer and generator in the rear of the property. D. Hammer said we'd actually like to move the island. J. Smith explained that there will be bollards for each overhead doorjamb and by the relocated mechanicals adjacent to the electrical room. We will work with the Fire Department. J. Langdell

asked if there would be screening at the new location for the mechanicals. E. Sandford said not right next to it but there will be shrubbery that goes out beyond the building to screen the area from Hammond Rd.

Lighting:

E. Sandford explained that the system would be made up of a combination of timers, photo cells and motion sensors to manage the light load. We will not be lit all evening, but do need security as this is a remote location. Lot F will have 12' high ornamental pole lights because of their aesthetic appeal but they can be switched out, if needed. J. Smith referenced the lighting chart to show the intensity and explained that the lighting fixture is actually a cap on top and the thin profile LED light originates at top and casts downward.

Chairman Beer opened the hearing for public comment; there being none, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

Off-site improvements:

P. Amato said we don't have a lot of options; if the applicant doesn't pay for this, who else will? This improvement benefits the applicant a great deal and I wouldn't want to approve a plan without the improvements on Hammond Rd. D. Hammer said he agreed, we will clearly benefit from Hammond Rd being improved and also agreed the road is inadequate for the current tenants. If you watch the traffic coming in and out of JP Pest and the karate dojo, number, size and type of vehicles are larger than people believe. Honestly, it should have been done already, but it hasn't been. I need it for the dealership and we're also trying to help improve that section of town. It does have to happen but at some level, there should be some sharing of that burden; what that mix is, I don't know. P. Amato referenced past situations, where applicants have worked with DPW to make a contribution and the Town did the work or contracted it out. As far as timing, I would definitely want the road improvements completed prior to a C/O. J. Langdell agreed and brought up JP Pest; they had two projects without any contribution. D. Hammer said he has not talked with JP Pest but is working with Bob Lamattina as we are in the process of improving his parking area, an obligation of the recently approved lot line adjustment. P. Amato said we don't control any purse strings but it is a town road and it is not up to par. J. Langdell said it has been up to par for those uses up until this point; have there been any accidents or complaints? P. Amato said the Hammers are making a big investment here and they can't do that without the road being fixed. C. Beer agreed but felt that the entire burden shouldn't have to fall on the applicant as there are other businesses there and it is a town road. P. Amato said maybe the Town would abate their taxes for a period of time to help offset the costs. J. Langdell said that would be a decision at the BOS level and we would send a recommendation. L. Daley said he had discussion with Rick Riendeau about the cost estimate on fairness and what would be realistic and rational for a sharing opportunity. The applicant could complete the majority of improvements and maybe the town would consider doing the final paving coat. S. Desmarais said the final coat would run about \$18,000. L. Daley said the entire paving budget is \$26,500. D. Hammer said that a 75%/25% split would be a reasonable approach.

M. Bender, Town Administrator said this would fall into the 2017 budget and we could work it into our paving budget. We have had some complaints about the narrowness of the road and with some of the stonewalls; it is below town standards and a 25% share would be reasonable considering the benefit this development would have for the long term growth of the town. This could also be a good economic boost for that area of town.

K. Federico said he certainly wouldn't want to put the Selectmen or the Town in a situation where this Board makes a recommendation of a 75/25 split without running it up the flagpole, nor would he want to commit to anything without a firm understanding and the support of the rest of the Selectmen. It's a great idea; I can see the advantages of the split and if asked, I would be in support of this. However, I don't want to imply that the Town will do that without it going through the appropriate channels and we don't know what the 2017 budget will be yet or if it will even have BOS support as we come off default budgets the past two years. To move this forward, there should be further conversation between the developers and DPW to possibly work something out and bring to the Board of Selectmen. P. Amato noted that this development will probably add \$40,000-\$60,000 to the tax base. J. Langdell said she appreciated everything discussed, but does not remember anything previously approved that did not get passed through the appropriate channels.

S. Desmarais suggested a conditional approval with just the binder in place, so you have the safety of the width and if he doesn't want to open the dealership without the final coat he has the choice to do the finish coat himself or you can work it out between now and say April 1st. P. Amato said we know we need to get it done and this is

only one price; there are many contractors out there. The offsite improvements need to get done, at minimum, to base coat prior to Certificate of Occupancy and the applicant could continue to work with the Town on the cost sharing. D. Hammer said he would be ok with that. C. Beer said he was not comfortable with sticking the developer with full price of doing the road and would rather have a firm decision from the Town. T. Finan said even if you get unanimous support, the voters might not approve the budget. L. Daley said he has concerns about what happens if the BOS doesn't support this and discussion on the finalization of the road ensued. S. Desmarais said base coat is better than what you have now and the safety issue is with the width, not how pretty it is. J. Langdell said it would be poor planning on this Board's part to agree to a road that is not to full standards with final paving. P. Amato agreed that the road will be wider and meet the safety criteria, but then it becomes the Town's responsibility as it is a town road. We can agree that the offsite improvements need to be done and at minimum all improvements up to base coat need to be done before C/O is issued and that the applicant continue to work with the Town on the cost sharing. K. Federico said he understands that they need to move forward and as long as the applicant understands the mindset behind this and that the money might not be there, then he didn't see a problem to move forward with that condition. D. Hammer said we will be fine with that, as long as everybody is working in a fair and reasonable way toward a common goal to come up with a solution. P. Amato said we want the safety aspect for this road. The final coat would not be required before C/O, but it needs to be done. This doesn't go to town vote; it is part of the road improvement plan budget and discussion on completion dates ensued. K. Federico said the Planning Board could grant conditional approval to bring Hammond Rd up to base coat prior to C/O and also make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen that they work with the applicant to resolve the money aspect; unhinge the two issues. Final coat is to be completed by the end of June, 2017 and the \$18,000 can be negotiated. J. Langdell added that the Planning Board will make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen that there be a collaborative effort to finalize Hammond Rd.

J. Langdell said she reviewed the draft easements and noted that Steve's name is listed as Seven and should be corrected for the final documents.

P. Amato made a motion to conditionally approve the application incorporating staff comments from the staff memo dated 6/26/16 and those details discussed tonight. K. Federico seconded and all in favor. The motion carried unanimously; vote 7-0-0.

1. The plans be revised in accordance with Staff comments per the Staff Memo dated June 26, 2016:
 - a. Revise Sheet 2, General Note 7 to reflect the total area of the one-story proposed auto dealership building.
 - b. Revise Sheet 2, Car Parking and Inventory Stock Capacity Table to reflect the total area of the one story structure and number of spaces required.
 - c. Revise Sheet 2, Car Parking and Inventory Stock Capacity Table by changing the dimensions of the "regular spaces" and "inventory stock spaces" to read 9'x18' and 8'x18'.
 - d. Revise Sheets 2 through 6, by modifying the parking areas to display and differentiate between the regular parking spaces inventory stock spaces. The dimensions for the regular parking space shall be 9'x18' and the inventory stock spaces shall be 8'x18'.
 - e. Revise Sheets 2 and 4, the parking area containing the "F"-Lot to show a fifteen (15) vehicle maximum display area.
 - f. Revise the "Non-Striped" inventory space details throughout plan for consistency.
 - g. Revise Sheet 2, General Note 17 to include all state and local approvals and related approval dates.
 - h. Amend Sheet 2, General Note 18 to read, "Plan is subject to all application fees and Police Impact Fees. The project development will be subject specific offsite improvements to Hammond Road."
 - i. Revise Sheet 11, Sign & Fence Details to show the design specifications and construction details for the 45' x 13' dumpster and refuse area depicted on Sheet 5, Landscaping & Erosion Control Plan.
 - j. Revise Sheet 10, Detail Sheet to include the design and construction details for the grass pavers related to the vehicle display areas.
 - k. A note be added to the plan stating that the maximum capacity of outdoor parking will be no more than 450 vehicles on site, at one time.
2. The applicant shall work with staff to finalize the landscape plan in accordance with Milford Development Regulations, Section 6.08.
3. All drainage, access, and temporary roadway construction easements shall be completed and submitted to the Town for final review and approval.

4. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the auto dealership building, the offsite improvements, as depicted on the Plan Set, Sheet 13 Hammond Road Improvement Plan, shall be completed up to base coat. Completion of the final coat for Hammond Road shall be done by the end of June, 2017.

Little Nell Trust/Milred Ninety Six, LLC – Capron Road – Map 43, Lots 57 & 58. Major site plan; to construct 124 new apartments consisting of 3 three-story garden style homes and 4 four-unit townhomes with associated site improvements

Chairman Beer read correspondence dated 6/9/16 from Patrick Colburn, Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc.

J. Langdell made a motion to table this application to the 7/26/16 meeting. S. Robinson seconded and all in favor. Motion carried unanimously 7-0-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

L. Daley said staff has received the AoT application for the proposed multi-purpose ball fields off Heron Pond Rd. The plan, developed by Fieldstone Engineering, will need Planning Board and Conservation Commission input. The Planning Board could hold a joint meeting at the 7/5/16 worksession for a presentation and to provide advisory comments. J. Langdell said the door was left open that there would be public comment and we should be part of the solution not the hiccup. This should be advertised, even though it's advisory. Discussion regarding the logistics ensued. K. Federico said the Selectmen have seen the plan and sent it to the Conservation Commission and Planning Board, but there has been no public hearing at the BOS level. L. Daley said this project requires an AoT permit from the state as there is some grading associated with the development of the fields themselves and we wanted to get the ball rolling. A. Fraizer asked when the plans will be distributed and if the Zoning Board and MCAA would be invited. L. Daley replied that the plans will be circulated tomorrow. J. Langdell said this will be a joint meeting between the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission; there are no zoning issues here. A. Fraizer added that she has questions and would like to invite MCAA for their expertise. J. Langdell said this doesn't mean we only hold one meeting if there are many questions we can't answer and we can include those groups in the distribution but we don't want to add additional boards to the meeting. K. Federico said this might be a well-attended meeting and should be held in the auditorium. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the date would be 7/5/16 and the worksession would begin at 6:30 PM to discuss the proposed ERZ district and then hold the presentation at 7:00PM.

L. Daley said the CIP will start up in mid-July.

L. Daley said we will be applying for a grant to fix swinging bridge and are working with Heritage Commission and Historical Society.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15PM on a motion made by J. Langdell, seconded by T. Finan and all in favor.

Motion to approve: K. Federico

Motion to second: D. Knott

MINUTES OF THE 6/28/16 MEETING APPROVED ON AUGUST 23, 2016